

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 11, and 21-24 are currently being amended.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate status identifier for each claim

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-11 and 13-24 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

a. Rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-10 based on Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al.

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0177453) in view of Noreen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0183059). A prima facie case of obviousness requires that the prior art reference or references teaches or suggests all of the claimed limitations. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of each of claims 1-4 and 6-10.

More specifically, the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest “a mobile resources server coupled to the communications network and configured to provide information about availability of network services, wherein the network services include at least one of Internet access, wireless messaging, e-mail, and printing” as recited in the combination of elements of claim 1 as amended. The Office Action acknowledges that “Chen et al is silent in disclosing a mobile resources server coupled to the communications

and configured to provide information about available resources.” As to Noreen et al., it teaches providing information pertaining to a broadcast radio segment. Thus, the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 2-4 and 6-10 depend from claim 1 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 2-4 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

b. Rejection of claims 11-20 based on Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al.

In section 5 of the Office Action, claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. A prima facie case of obviousness requires that the prior art reference or references teaches or suggests all of the claimed limitations. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of each of claims 11-20.

More specifically, the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest “wherein the mobile resources server is configured to provide information about available network services, and wherein the network services include at least one of Internet access, wireless messaging, e-mail, and printing” as recited in the combination of elements of claim 11 as amended. The Office Action acknowledges that “Chen et al is silent in disclosing wherein a mobile resources server configured to provide information about available resources.” As to Noreen et al., it teaches providing information pertaining to a broadcast radio segment. Thus, the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 12-20 depend from claim 11 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. for

at least the same reasons as claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

c. Rejection of claim 21 based on Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al.

In section 6 of the Office Action, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. A prima facie case of obviousness requires that the prior art reference or references teaches or suggests all of the claimed limitations. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 21.

More specifically, the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest “providing information to the mobile device, from a mobile resources server, about the availability status of network services to the mobile device, wherein the network services include at least one of Internet access, wireless messaging, e-mail, and printing” as recited in the combination of steps of claim 21 as amended. The Office Action acknowledges that “Chen et al is silent in disclosing providing information to the mobile device, from a mobile resources server, about resources available to the mobile device.” As to Noreen et al., it teaches providing information pertaining to a broadcast radio segment. Thus, the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

d. Rejection of claims 1, 5, 11, 15, and 22-24 based on Wang in view of Noreen et al.

In section 7 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 11, 15, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0160745) in view of Noreen et al. A prima facie case of obviousness requires that the prior art reference or references teaches or suggests all of the claimed limitations. In re Royka, 490

F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Chen et al. in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of each of claims 1, 5, 11, 15, and 22-24.

i. Claims 1 and 5

With regard to claim 1, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest “a mobile resources server coupled to the communications network and configured to provide information about availability of network services, wherein the network services include at least one of Internet access, wireless messaging, e-mail, and printing” as recited in the combination of elements of claim 1 as amended. The Office Action acknowledges that “Wang is silent in disclosing a mobile resources server coupled to the communications and configured to provide information about available resources.” As to Noreen et al., it teaches providing information pertaining to a broadcast radio segment. Thus, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claim 5 depends from claim 1 and is thus patentable over the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants further request that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

ii. Claims 11 and 15

With regard to claim 11, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest “wherein the mobile resources server is configured to provide information about available network services, and wherein the network services include at least one of Internet access, wireless messaging, e-mail, and printing” as recited in the combination of elements of claim 11 as amended. The Office Action acknowledges that “Wang is silent in disclosing a mobile resources server coupled to the communications and configured to provide information about available resources.” As to Noreen et al., it teaches providing information pertaining to a

broadcast radio segment. Thus, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claim 15 depends from claim 11 and is thus patentable over the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants further request that the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

iii. Claim 22

With regard to claim 22, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest “locating a mobile resources server configured to provide information about availability of network services, wherein the network services include at least one of Internet access, wireless messaging, e-mail, and printing” as recited in the combination of steps of claim 22 as amended. The Office Action acknowledges that “Wang is silent in disclosing a mobile resources server coupled to the communications and configured to provide information about available resources.” As to Noreen et al., it teaches providing information pertaining to a broadcast radio segment. Thus, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

iv. Claim 23

With regard to claim 23, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest “verifying the request by the mobile resources proxy using a mobile resources server, wherein the mobile resources server is also configured to provide information about availability of network services, wherein the network services include at least one of Internet access, wireless messaging, e-mail, and printing” as recited in the combination of steps of claim 23 as amended. The Office Action acknowledges that “Wang is silent in disclosing a mobile resources server coupled to the communications and configured to provide information about available resources.” As to Noreen et al., it teaches providing information pertaining to a

broadcast radio segment. Thus, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

v. Claim 24

With regard to claim 24, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest “sending the authorization information to a mobile resources server that verifies the authorization information, wherein the mobile resources server is also configured to provide information about availability of network services, wherein the network services include at least one of Internet access, wireless messaging, e-mail, and printing” as recited in the combination of steps of claim 24 as amended. The Office Action acknowledges that “Wang is silent in disclosing a mobile resources server coupled to the communications and configured to provide information about available resources.” As to Noreen et al., it teaches providing information pertaining to a broadcast radio segment. Thus, the cited combination of Wang in view of Noreen et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 24. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid

amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 4/17/2006

By Chad E. Bement

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5554
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Chad E. Bement
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 54,991